WORLD CONGRESS

for general disarmament and

PEACE

address by
N. S. Khrushchev:
General and complete disarmament — guarantee of peace and security for all people

WORLD

Congress

for general disarmament and

PEACE

ADDRESS BY N.S. KHRUSHCHEV JULY 10, 1962

General and complete disarmament—guarantee of peace and security for all people

CROSSCURRENTS PRESS/NEW YORK

909.82
D637
no.25
c.2

DOCUMENTS OF CURRENT HISTORY NO. 25

ADDRESS BY N. S. KHRUSHCHEV AT THE WORLD CONGRESS FOR GENERAL DISARMAMENT AND PEACE is one of a series of translations being published by CROSSCURRENTS PRESS, INC. in response to the growing demand for information and source material on Soviet developments. The items in this series are issued for purposes of information, and the publication of an article, study or report implies neither acceptance nor rejection of the ideas contained therein. The text of this book was supplied by Novosti Press Agency (APN).

A copy of this material has been filed with the Department of Justice where the registration statement of CROSSCURRENTS PRESS, INC., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y., as a representative of The International Book Co. (Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga), a Soviet Government agency for the import and export of printed material, is available for inspection. Registration does not indicate approval or disapproval of this material by the United States Government.

264

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

CONTENTS

		Page
1.	Disarmament—the Compelling Need of Our Time	6
2.	The Soviet Disarmament Program	19
3.	A World Without Arms Would Be a Great Blessing for All Mankind	43
4.	The Peoples Can and Must Achieve Disarmament and Preserve the Peace	54

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV'S SPEECH AT THE WORLD CONGRESS FOR GENERAL DISARMAMENT AND PEACE

Dear delegates and guests of the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace:

Dear fellow fighters for peace:

Comrades and friends:

To begin with, allow me, on behalf of the Soviet Government and the people of our country, to welcome you here and to thank you for picking Moscow as the place for this, history's most representative congress of spokesmen of the forces of peace. All the Soviet people are here with you in this auditorium in heart and spirit because the goals of the congress coincide to the letter with their most cherished hopes.

The World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace is one of the most significant events of our time. Spokesmen of nearly all the nations of our globe, people of different races and nationalities, classes and social groups, parties and political convictions, men and women of the various religions, and atheists have put aside all that divides them, and have come together to discuss the most urgent issue of our time—how to block off war.

Mankind is living in a momentous epoch. The unprecedented acceleration of social progress, the striking upheaval in science and technology, in our knowledge of nature, are capable of giving all people on earth the greatest blessings.

But we must never forget that the sinister forces of aggression and evil threaten to turn the achievements of human genius against mankind and civilization.

Vigorous and immediate action by all sections of the people is called for to handcuff, once and for all, the criminal hands stretching out to the buttons of a nuclear-missile war. The success of the effort to unify all the peoples and all who want to live and build against the threat of a new world war depends largely on the peace fighters. So may this responsibility to mankind lend inspiration to the delegates to this congress!

1. DISARMAMENT—THE COMPELLING NEED OF OUR TIME

Dear friends, like the heads of the other governments participating in the Geneva disarmament negotiations, I have been invited to tell the congress about my country's standpoint in the matter of general and complete disarmament. The Soviet Government has accepted the invitation with gratitude and considers it its duty to present to the congress its views on this most important problem of our time.

We must all face the facts squarely. The threat of a new world war really exists. Mankind may be drawn into it if determined measures are not taken. It is all too obvious that thermonuclear weapons are continuously being improved; their accumulation in the arsenals is reaching the critical point where, as we used to say, "the guns start speaking of their own volition," and, as we can now put it, paraphrasing this saying, where "rockets with thermonuclear warheads will start flying." Nuclear weapons are being placed in an increasing number of countries. More and more military units are getting them. This adds continuously to the danger of the adventurist groups starting a new world war.

Never before have war preparations proceeded on so gigantic a scale as today. The league of war —industrial monopolies, the "death merchants" and the zealot militarists—this "military-industrial complex," as ex-President Eisenhower described it —is heating up the arms race to a frenzy. Competent Western atomic scientists estimate that the "nuclear death potential" in the contemporary world amounts to 250,000 megatons, or 250,000 million tons of TNT. This makes more than 80 tons of explosives for every inhabitant of our planet. Explosives, as you see, are a product that the world population has in abundant supply.

Even according to official figures the world spends 120 billion on war needs every year. This is equal to about half the capital investment made in the world economy. It equals about two-thirds of the total national income of all the economically un-

derdeveloped countries. The NATO countries alone spend a million dollars every ten minutes on war preparations!

The United States ranks first in the scale of its war preparations. In seventeen years, from 1946 to 1962, direct and indirect U.S. military expenditures added up to something like 900 billion, or nearly as much as all the capitalist countries combined spent in the Second World War. The other NATO countries are following the same disastrous path of military waste. Their war machine has grown to fantastic proportions.

The arms race is consuming a colossal amount of the people's labor. Today more than 20,000,000 people are serving in the armed forces, and more than 100,000,000 are giving of their energy to military pursuits. Seventy per cent of the world's scientific personnel is, in one way or another, employed in the military sphere. The threat that militarism will engulf civilian society is becoming a reality in the Western countries.

Lately, the Western press has been harping on the contention that the dangers of a thermonuclear war and its consequences are highly exaggerated. The United States, it is said, can afford to start such a war because it is not much worse than an ordinary one. It will involve only a "somewhat" greater number of victims, "somewhat" greater material losses, and make rehabilitation only "somewhat" more difficult. To survive, it is said, one need only build shelters in advance and adapt oneself to the way of life of the mole.

There was a time when ex-President Eisenhower and then his successor, President Kennedy, were realistic and said that the military strength of the Soviet Union and the United States was equal. This was President Kennedy's standpoint at the time of our Vienna meeting. At present, however, the U.S. leadership has set out to impress upon their own people and the peoples in the Allied countries that the balance of strength has tipped in favor of the United States. The purpose of these contentions is quite clear. By saying that they will win the war the American militarists are trying to put heart into their own armed forces and those of their allies.

This dangerous conception is in itself aimed at increasing the tension in international affairs and adding to the war threat. But from the point of view of reality it does not have a leg to stand on.

I wonder how the American leaders came to adduce that the relation of strength has changed in their favor? They have nothing to back up this claim. If the matter were examined objectively, the state of affairs would look entirely different. In order to ensure its security, the Soviet Union was forced in the past few years to develop nuclear weapons of 50, 100 and more megatons, intercontinental rockets, the global rocket, which is practically impervious to defense, and an antimissile rocket. The ruling groups of the United States, who do not have the same powerful military weapons, have no reason at all to say that the balance of strength has changed in their favor.

It is common knowledge that the relation of strength is measured in military action and, more precisely, by the outcome of a war. In his day, Hitler kept saying that he had a tremendous margin of strength, but he was overwhelmed by the Soviet Union and its allies. Today, when there are nuclear missile weapons on hand, errors in the judgment of the balance of strength are incalculably more dangerous to the peoples. Who can say, for example, how many 100-megaton bombs are needed to destroy the cities of, say, West Germany, or of the other powers whose leaders are in a bellicose mood? The false claims of the U.S. leadership that the balance of forces favors the USA over the Soviet Union are fraught with the greatest peril both for the peoples of other countries and for the American people.

Lately, the militarists talk more and more about thermonuclear war. They are building up a kind of thermonuclear war cult. Take Defense Secretary McNamara's speech of June 16. It is a typical example. He says in it that an understanding may be reached to use nuclear weapons solely for striking at the armed forces, and not at the big cities. The U.S. press says that McNamara's statement had the approval of the White House, and interprets it as a kind of proposal to the Soviet Union on "rules" of conducting a nuclear war.

What is there to say about this "proposal"?

It is a monstrous proposal filled from beginning to end with a misanthropic disdain for man, for mankind, because it seeks to legalize nuclear war

and thereby the murder of millions upon millions of people.

It shows that certain groups in the United States want to divert the main blow to countries that have American bases and armed forces, such as Italy, Turkey, Britain, West Germany, Japan, Greece, etc.

Lastly, it is also the grossest of deceptions so far as the population of the United States is concerned. Are there no armed forces in the big cities and in their vicinity? Will not the nuclear bombs, exploded according to McNamara's "rules" in, say, the suburbs of New York, singe that immense city with a deadly breath? Some countries do not have big cities like the United States, and the destruction of medium-size towns, townships and villages seems to be within the "rules" proposed by McNamara. And is not the population of medium-size towns and villages on which McNamara sees fit to shower atomic bombs just as dear as the population of the big cities? *We believe that what we must agree on is not rules for nuclear war but how to eliminate the very possibility of its breaking out,* so that towns, big and small, remain intact, and all townships, villages and farming communities remain intact as well.

In the present environment, world war should not be measured by old criteria and considered in outworn categories. We have to face up to the fact that the weapons of war have changed radically, from the bottom up, and that their destructive

force has increased to unheard of proportions. What does this imply?

Firstly, modern weapons cannot in any way be compared to the old. The explosive force of just one powerful hydrogen bomb is many times greater than that of all the explosives used in all the wars in history, including the First and Second World Wars.

Secondly, nuclear-missile war erases the line between the battlefield and the rear entirely. What is more, it is the civilian population that will be the first prey of the weapons of mass annihilation. In a war of that sort just a few thermonuclear bombs are liable to wipe out entire states, let alone the biggest industrial centers with populations of many millions.

American experts estimate that one 20-megaton H-bomb, exploded in the air, would raze to the ground all brick and frame houses within a range of 24 kilometers from the epicenter of the explosion. A roaring ocean of flame would engulf everything that burns, all living beings, over a stretch equal to the distance from New York to Philadelphia. Yet there are now bombs of 50, 100 and even more megatons. Scientists estimate roughly that the world stockpile of nuclear weapons is by now equal in force to 12,500,000 bombs of the kind dropped on Hiroshima.

Last but not least, with the current alignment of forces and the new types of weapons, the nuclear war advocated by the American militarists would not confine itself to the territories of just two

countries. It would be universal, and would bring destruction and death to millions of people all over the world. What would that cost mankind? One of the outstanding fighters against atomic death, the prominent American scientist Linus Pauling, estimates in his book *No More War!* that the probable number of nuclear war victims would be 800,000,000. This is the grim truth about the actual nature of thermonuclear war, and if Western statesmen today keep this truth from the peoples, they are committing a crime against humanity, the peoples of their own countries included.

Those who are balancing on the "brink of war" maintain that nuclear-missile weapons are in themselves sufficient guarantee that peace will prevail. This conception, known in the West as the "balance of terror," goes against common sense and is a gross deception of the people. In fact, the "balance of terror" signboard is used to camouflage plans for preventive war. Some responsible U.S. statesmen go to the length of declaring publicly that they are prepared to take the "initiative in a nuclear conflict with the Soviet Union."

Give this some thought. This is no mere threat of thermonuclear war but an attempt to impose an ill-omened competition as to who will be first to start the war. By saying that they can be the first to start a war, they seem to be giving the cue to other countries. Hurry, they say, and outdo your adversary.

What is this likely to lead to? The consequences will obviously be disastrous. It was a surprising

statement to make. Its authors have given no thought to what war holds in store for the United States itself, and for its allies. The U.S. politicians tell their people more and more insistently that in a nuclear war the United States will suffer smaller losses than the Soviet Union and can allegedly gain the upper hand. This is a fatuous illusion. It is meant to condition public opinion in the United States and the Allied countries to war: We must hurry and start the war now, they say, for the situation may change. This is nothing but conditioning men's minds to the inevitability of war and vindicating the aggressive forces who are eager to speed the outbreak of an atomic war.

But we declare most firmly: If the aggressors start a nuclear war, they will inevitably perish themselves in its flames.

It should be borne in mind that in a world of international tension even a simple mistake may trigger the lightning-like chain reaction of a universal war. Take the case of General Power, who heads the U.S. Strategic Air Command. In November 1961, after a false alarm, he ordered bombers stationed at all U.S. bases to head out for the Soviet Union. He did not even bother to inform the U.S. President, that is, the supreme commander of the country's armed forces, about it. For all of twelve and a half minutes the American Strategic Air Command was virtually in a state of war with the Soviet Union. Who is to guarantee that in the event of another false alarm the overzealous Ameri-

can generals will sound the retreat before disaster breaks loose?

There is a big danger that war may break out due to some technical miscalculation. Crashes of American planes carrying A- and H-bombs, and of rockets with nuclear warheads, are growing in number. Just a few weeks ago, on June 4, 1962, a "Thor" rocket was destroyed in the air due to some technical faults, and its nuclear warhead fell somewhere in the Pacific Ocean. The same happened on June 20. And things like that are very alarming. *La Giustizia,* an Italian newspaper, commented quite rightly that "the runaway 'Thor' could have set off a world war." This shows once more how dangerous the atomic psychosis of the reactionary Western militarist groups is to peace.

As long as the various national stockpiles of lethal weapons remain and grow, the war threat will grow too. The path to genuine peace is general and complete disarmament.

Dear delegates, I know that people of many and diverse political beliefs are assembled in this hall. They did not gather here to discuss the advantages of the different social systems. It was the common wish, the desire to salvage peace, to avert the ordeal of a thermonuclear war that has brought all of us here.

But one cannot help reminding this worldwide forum that the aggressive forces are pursuing the arms race and preparations for a new world war behind a smoke screen of talk about the war threat emanating from the Soviet Union and the

other socialist countries. These malicious falsehoods must not be discounted. Let me recall a few undeniable facts.

Ten million people were killed and twenty million were crippled in the First World War. Was it Communists or socialist states that were responsible for that war? At the time it broke out there were as yet no socialist states on earth, and the Communists were not in power in any of the countries.

The Second World War cost nearly fifty million lives. Was it the Communists, the socialist states, who started it? The Second World War was started by German, Italian and Japanese fascists. It was the Soviet Union that suffered the greatest losses in the act of saving mankind from fascist barbarity. It was the Soviet Union that made the greatest contribution to beating the fascists and delivering the peoples from the death camps, the gas chambers of Maidanek and Oswiecim, and from fascist slavery.

Was it the Soviet Union that made of Hiroshima and Nagasaki the Pompeii of our age? The culprits, as you know, came from quite another part of the world.

Let us see what the world looks like today. It is covered with a rash of war bases. Whose bases are they? All of you know that they were established by the United States and its allies.

Take war propaganda. Where is it conducted? Where do the calls come from to shower atomic bombs on a country, to destroy half of its population and three-quarters of its industrial po-

tential "in 24 hours"? General Nathan Twining and Congressman Olin Teague, who sounded these calls, are not citizens of any of the socialist countries. In the countries of the socialist community, where war propaganda has been outlawed, people of that sort would have been prosecuted in a court of law.

It was a cherished dream of the founder of the Soviet state, V. I. Lenin, that war would become impossible. He described world war as the greatest of crimes, a break from the accomplishments of modern civilization and culture. He warned that the use of formidable technical gains for the mass annihilation of millions of human lives and the conversion of all the productive forces to war needs inevitably "undermine the very conditions for the existence of human society" *(Coll. Works,* 4th Russian edition, Vol. 27, p. 386). The socialist countries warn the world of this danger and work hard to avert it. This is the positive truth about the standpoint of the socialist countries, the standpoint of the Communists.

Our Soviet state was born with Lenin's well-known Peace Decree. Lenin most vigorously rejected the suggestion that a sword be depicted on the Soviet coat of arms. "The sword is not an emblem for us," he said. It was the hammer and sickle that became the emblem of the Soviet land—a symbol of peaceful and constructive labor. We have stood, now stand, and will always stand upon Lenin's principles of peaceful coexistence. That is the only doctrine of relations between states with

different social systems that accords with the historical conditions of our age, on which basis peace can be preserved. No matter what people think about the way of life in countries of the other social system, the world is whole and indivisible in face of the threat of nuclear disaster. That is where we are all the human race.

Many people in the West ask ever more frequently, "Does mankind have a future?" I would like to reply to them: Yes it has, and it is going to be a radiant future. We believe that mankind has grown up to the task of bridling the atomic maniacs.

In this age of nuclear weapons, this age of rockets, the danger of a deadly nuclear war cannot be eliminated unless the means of mass annihilation are destroyed and nuclear weapons prohibited. We favor the complete destruction of the material means of warfare.

The policy of "from positions of strength," "brinkmanship" and "atomic intimidation" will be impossible in the international relations of a disarmed world. The slogan of general and complete disarmament is an equivalent of the slogan: "Down with wars between nations. Long live peace!"

That is why the struggle for general and complete disarmament is becoming the prime duty of the peace forces, of all the national and international organizations and trends advocating the maintenance and promotion of peace. Disarmament is an imperative demand of our times.

2. THE SOVIET DISARMAMENT PROGRAM

Dear delegates, the Soviet Government is firmly and consistently carrying on a policy of promoting peace and peaceful coexistence. In putting forward its program for general and complete disarmament, the Soviet Government was prompted by the necessity for radically solving the problem of security for all nations by precluding the very possibility of war.

What is the main point of our program? The pivot and core of disarmament is the banning and complete destruction of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Government suggests at least the immobilizing of all nuclear weapons, paralyzing them by destroying all means of their delivery from the outset, at the very first stage of disarmament. We propose abolishing at one stroke rockets, aircraft, surface warships and submarines that can carry nuclear weapons, atomic artillery installations and all military bases on foreign soil, and withdrawing all foreign troops from the countries concerned.

Without rockets, aircraft, surface warships and submarines, nuclear arms would no longer be dangerous even if an unscrupulous government stowed some of them away. The destruction of all means of delivery would make it impossible for any country possessing atomic weapons to strike a nuclear blow at other countries. A proposal to this effect was made at one time by the French President, General de Gaulle, and we fully agree with it. Unfortunately, the French Government took no effective steps in behalf of its own proposal. What

is more, it refused to take part in the disarmament negotiations at Geneva.

It is said that nuclear weapons can also be carried in TU-114's, Boeing 707's and other civil aircraft. But if there is a real desire for disarmament, the various countries may for a while keep their means of defense—anti-aircraft artillery and air defense rockets and fighters. Modern means of warfare make it possible to shoot down any aircraft flying at any altitude. As you see, the argument is thoroughly untenable.

By proposing that disarmament begin with the abolition of all vehicles of delivery of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union, which has the world's most powerful global and intercontinental missiles, relinquishes of its own free will a most important military advantage. We are ready to take this step because we believe that it would expedite the solution of the disarmament problem.

For our part, we insist that the Western Powers agree to abolish all of their military bases on foreign soil and withdraw their troops from foreign countries. Those bases have been set up for aggression and not for defense. It must be obvious to anyone that, say, the U.S. rocket and nuclear bases on the Japanese island of Okinawa or in Libya, on African soil, or the U.S. bases in Britain, Italy, Turkey, Greece and Thailand are not needed for the defense of the United States. Whoever denies this is trying to pass off black for white.

Mr. Douglas, member of the U.S. Supreme Court, makes a revealing admission on this score. The U.S.

has ringed Russia with airfields, he writes in his book, where American bombers and fighter planes are in combat readiness around the clock. The American bases included Morocco, where for a number of years U.S. bombers carrying atomic bombs patrolled the skies day and night, ready to head for set targets on receipt of a coded signal. This is added proof that the threat of a new world war will persist so long as these bases exist.

To greatly ease the threat of armed conflict between countries, the Soviet Union also proposes that at the very beginning of disarmament the numerical strength of national armed forces be substantially cut and conventional armaments reduced accordingly. We think it possible to carry disarmament through to the end in four years. This is a short but perfectly adequate time limit.

We are willing to seek and find mutually acceptable formulas for all the provisions of our draft treaty, and to compromise wherever necessary —that is, of course, if that will not harm the cause of general and complete disarmament. The only thing we are not willing to do is to renounce general and complete disarmament, to emasculate our draft treaty, to strip it of all real disarmament measures. That is something to which we will never agree.

We are for disarmament and not for talk of disarmament. A situation in which the arms race is growing in intensity even as disarmament negotiations go on can no longer be tolerated. According to estimates made by the *U.S. News and World*

Report, the 17 years from 1946 to 1962 have seen 863 international disarmament meetings, which took 17,000 hours to hold and at which 18 million words were uttered. While millions of words about disarmament become so much useless slag of history, arms production is increasing. Certain Western circles turn disarmament negotiations into a talking club to be able to maintain, behind the smoke screen of verbiage about disarmament, favorable conditions for war business and continue to pile up armaments.

The Western Powers' behavior at Geneva indicates that they want no disarmament. The speeches made by the delegates of the United States and its allies at Geneva are purely perfunctory and declarative. Those delegates pretend that their negative stand is acceptable and represent us as opponents of agreement. But let us look into the U.S. proposals.

You will recall that after a long delay the U.S. finally submitted an outline of basic provisions of a treaty on disarmament. That outline shows that the U.S. stand on general and complete disarmament remains essentially negative, although so far as secondary points and form are concerned, that stand has now been somewhat varnished and contains many words about disarmament.

But in reality the "basic provisions" do not envisage what is precisely the basic thing, namely, a complete ban on nuclear arms, the destruction of all stockpiles accumulated by nations, and the abolition of military bases on foreign soil. To agree

to this sort of "disarmament" would mean deceiving the peoples and injuring the cause of peace.

No sooner had negotiations begun than the United States and its partners attempted again, as in the past, to shift all attention from disarmament questions to the much-advertised problem of international control, alleging that control was the crux of the disarmament problem.

As regards the meaning of the U.S. proposal for control, it is the same old demand for control without disarmament, slightly refurbished.

True, this time it is presented more subtly than before, but its meaning is the same—it is designed to set up a legalized system of international espionage for the benefit of a potential aggressor. The Russian people say about this kind of "novelty"—"it's the same broth but a bit thinner."

Our position is simple and easy to understand. We stand for completely abolishing the various kinds of armament, one after another. Furthermore, every step toward general and complete disarmament envisaged in our draft treaty is invariably accompanied by measures for strict international control.

But we are against establishing control over armaments that will remain. Control over remaining weapons is bound to be reconnaissance, an attempt to ascertain whether the balance of forces has changed as a result of the cut in armaments and whether it is not possible to use eventual changes for launching an attack. No self-respecting country can accept such control.

The Western Powers are seeking all-inclusive control while proposing very limited disarmament measures. The United States proposes beginning disarmament with a 30 per cent reduction of the means of delivery of nuclear weapons and certain conventional armaments.

But the question arises whether the actual threat of war would be eased thereby. No, it would not, because a huge thermonuclear potential would be retained. Mr. Nehru, the esteemed Prime Minister of India, is perfectly right in declaring that "disarmament is no more a question of reduction of armament. A quarter of the nuclear arsenal of the Great Powers is enough to wipe out the whole world."

Furthermore, the U.S., which proposes a 30 per cent reduction of the number of ICBM's and global missiles at the first stage, wants to keep the existing network of military bases. The U.S. virtually does not provide for the abolition of military bases on foreign territory and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the countries concerned even at the third stage of disarmament. Does the U.S. Government really imagine that the Soviet Union would agree to a 30 per cent cut at the first stage and to another 35 per cent cut at the second stage in its most developed, most powerful combat missiles while the U.S. military bases, so situated as to be able to strike at our territory, remained absolutely intact? We are not our own enemies and will never agree to that sort of disarmament, if it can be called that.

And lastly, with this approach to the matter, U.S. acceptance of partial disarmament looks like a stratagem intended to discover all the arsenals of our national security, that is, to throw the doors open to a reconnaissance and espionage system and thus make things easier for the potential aggressor. The so-called inspection by zones envisaged by the U.S. "outline" also pursues an obvious aim, which is to establish the exact location of Soviet rocket and nuclear installations. In this case we may say, paraphrasing an American expression, that the reconnaissance tail wags the policy dog.

All difficulties over the issue of control arise from the fact that the Western Powers virtually dissociate it from the fulfillment of the decisive task, that is, real disarmament. We call on the Western Powers once again to accept our proposals for general and complete disarmament, and then we will accept any control measures they may propose.

The U.S. Government suggests establishing large international armed forces and insists on their being equipped with nuclear arms. It regards the so-called "UN troops" in the Congo as a model of such forces. It is legitimate to ask, as we have already done more than once: Who will command those forces? Who will give the orders? The U.S. says the United Nations will. But what would this imply in practice? The UN machinery in its present form is dominated by the very powers that govern NATO, as events in the Congo clearly showed. In these circumstances, to accept the U.S. proposal

would mean choosing suicide, disarming ourselves and enabling NATO to use the international armed forces for dictating its will to us.

The only reasonable solution of the problem is to provide equal opportunities for control of the international forces. Today there are three groups of countries represented in the United Nations, and each group should enjoy the same rights and opportunities as the other two.

Is it normal that, because of U.S. resistance, the People's Republic of China has not to this day assumed its lawful seat in the United Nations?

Only under conditions in which all groups of states are equal will there be no abuses of the international armed forces to the detriment of any one of the groups of countries. It stands to reason that placing nuclear weapons at the disposal of the international armed forces is out of the question. It would be equivalent to mocking the peoples who insist on being delivered forever from the horrors of a nuclear war.

The United States also suggests empowering the International Court, which has no right of veto, to adopt decisions binding on countries, including decisions on peace and security issues. That proposal, which in fact undermines the UN Charter and nullifies the role of the Security Council as the chief agency for the maintenance of international peace and security, is aimed at infringing Soviet interests and replacing the UN by a new international political system in which the Western Powers expect to occupy a dominant position. Can

we accept such a thing? Of course not. These proposals are aimed at undermining, not promoting, peace.

The U.S. persists in its refusal to specify the general time limit for the implementation of general and complete disarmament measures, although it now gives time limits for the first two stages. The provisions of the U.S. outline have been so worded as to enable the Western Powers to stall indefinitely on disarmament and, indeed, to foil it if at a particular moment they come to the conclusion that strategically it is to their advantage to do so.

Lastly, I cannot withhold mention of the fact that, as becomes increasingly evident at Geneva, the U.S. does not at all want a treaty of general and complete disarmament that would oblige countries to scrap their war machinery within a strictly defined period of time. U.S. Government spokesmen plainly tell our delegates at Geneva that the U.S. Government would never sign, nor Congress ratify, a general and complete disarmament treaty. It follows that the U.S. is merely talking of disarmament while actually taking a stand against it.

The Soviet Union is prepared to take account, as it has done in the past, of all the suggestions of the Western Powers that do not contradict the solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament. But such suggestions are still very few.

We are prepared to consider carefully any proposal of our partners in negotiations, to seek for and find mutually acceptable ways of advancing the

working out of a disarmament treaty. We are prepared to do our utmost so that the work of the Eighteen Nation Committee in Geneva may succeed and our collective efforts result in an effective program for disarmament.

World opinion favors the conclusion of a disarmament treaty and offers advice as to how to surmount the differences. The message to this congress by philosopher Bertrand Russell is noteworthy in that respect.

Lord Russell says: "I should like all negotiators from the West to state, 'I am firmly convinced that the nuclear war would be worse than the worldwide victory of communism.' I should like every negotiator from the East to declare, 'I am firmly convinced that a nuclear war would be worse than a worldwide victory of capitalism.' Those on either side who refuse to make such a declaration would brand themselves as enemies of mankind and advocate the extinction of the human race."

We, the spokesmen of the socialist world, have never said that we are prepared to launch a thermonuclear war for the sake of a communist victory throughout the world. Our leader, V. I. Lenin, proclaimed the policy of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems back in the early years of our Revolution, and stated that the struggle against the capitalist system should be transferred to the sphere of economic competition. We stand squarely upon these Leninist principles.

We do not interpret Mr. Russell's message to be an appeal for an ultimatum: either war and

atomic death or recognition of communism, and, vice versa, either nuclear war or the recognition of capitalism. We believe that if either side works for the victory of its ideology and policy by augmenting its armed forces and its threats of war, things will surely move toward a worldwide nuclear war. We declare to the whole world that the policy of starting a world war in order that communist ideology should win out is alien to us.

We proceed from the fact that there are two systems in the world—one system of states based on capitalist principles and another based on the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, on socialist principles. An ideological and political struggle is in progress between these two systems. We believe that this struggle should not be projected into a war between the states with different social systems and that the matter should be settled through peaceful competition. Let every country of the socialist world prove the advantages of its system by peaceful endeavor.

The main criteria are: Which system, the capitalist or the socialist, provides greater material and spiritual blessings, higher living and cultural standards for the masses of people, which of them provides genuine freedom for the individual and ensures the rapid development of the productive forces, culture and science in the interest of man, in the interest of the people.

We believe this to be the basis on which to settle the debate about whose system, whose views are progressive and which system really serves the

interests of the masses. The system that proves its advantages will win the minds of men.

The program of general and complete disarmament put forward by the Soviet Government is the most striking and strongest proof of our desire to settle controversial issues through peaceful competition, not by war. It also shows that we are confident of winning the peaceful competition with capitalism. Those, on the other hand, who oppose disarmament and say that war between capitalist and socialist countries is inevitable, lack confidence in the strength of capitalism and its victory in the peaceful competition with socialism.

This is why they clutch at nuclear war as at a chance for deliverance. Spokesmen for Western ruling circles say for all to hear that atomic death is better than the victory of communism.

Mr. Pella, for example, the former Foreign Minister of Italy, said, "Italy would rather run the risk of a Soviet atomic attack than fall under communist domination."* Lord Birdwood said in the House of Lords on February 11, 1959, "I do not wish to continue to live on in such a [Communist] world: I would sooner be destroyed." Rodney Gilbert, an American author, in his book *Competitive Coexistence—The New Soviet Challenge,* said, "Peace without a victory over communism be damned!"

Even one of the right-wing labor leaders, Donnelly, exhorts, "Better dead than red."

These are very dangerous things to say. They show that some Western spokesmen want to project

* All quotations from non-Russian sources are re-translated from the Russian.

the competition from the economic sphere, the sphere where the advantages of one system over another are tested by history, into the sphere of war. This means that many defenders of imperialism have lost confidence in capitalism's ability to win the competition against socialism and are prepared to start a destructive world war, to bring death to millions upon millions of people for the sake of preserving capitalism.

We communists are confident in the strength of socialism, in its advantages. It is a thing history has already proved. Socialism has in a short time demonstrated its viability, its supremacy in rate of economic development, scientific and technological progress, public education, and the provision of true freedoms for the masses.

The heights which the Soviet Union has now scaled are imposing evidence of the advantages of socialism. We are not afraid of competing with capitalism. Let capitalism, too, as Mr. Russell suggests, abandon the idea of war and project its debate with socialism onto the plane of peaceful competition.

The great significance of our stand lies in the fact that we project the solution of the main controversial question of our time, that of which system is better—it is in this controversy that many representatives of Western ruling circles espy the chief reason for the inevitability of armed conflict—from the military sphere into the sphere of peaceful competition between countries with different social systems. The possibility is thereby

created of delivering mankind from thermonuclear war.

Peace can be radically safeguarded through the complete abolition of the physical machinery of war. The Soviet Government does not rule out but, on the contrary, considers it indispensable, in advancing to this goal, to agree on the adoption of a series of steps toward lessening international tension, strengthening confidence among countries, and considerably facilitating general and complete disarmament. Among such measures we include the establishment of denuclearized zones in various areas, renunciation of the further spread of nuclear weapons, the withdrawal of troops from foreign territories, the prohibition of war propaganda, and the conclusion of a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO).

We have made numerous attempts to reach agreement with the Western Powers on a limited disarmament program but have invariably come up against a refusal.

Take the disarmament proposals we presented to the Western Powers in 1955. Those were not proposals for general and complete disarmament—they only called for a reduction of the armed forces of the Soviet Union and the United States to 1,500,000 men. Nor was this figure at all accidental, because the Western Powers themselves named it in the course of talks then in progress. But what happened? As soon as we had agreed to the contingent of 1,500,000 men for the USSR and the

U.S., our partners called it off and turned down our proposal.

In 1957 the Soviet Government proposed an agreement on at least partial disarmament measures.

Among these measures we included, this time as well, the Western Powers' own proposal for establishing aerial photography zones with a view to discovering secret preparations for aggression. You may remember that aerial photography at that time was a pet idea of President Eisenhower's. We proposed establishing an aerial photography zone in Europe, 800 kilometers deep on either side of the demarcation line between the armed forces of NATO and the WTO. The zone was to have comprised the territories of the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Czechoslovakia and a sizable strip of Soviet territory. The other zone was to have covered our Far East all the way to Lake Baikal and an equal part of U.S. territory. In the same period we proposed setting up control posts at railway junctions, in harbors, and on motor highways to prevent surprise attack. In this case too we took Western suggestions into consideration.

And what was the outcome? What lot befell our proposals for aerial photography zones and control posts? They were rejected by the United States and the other NATO Powers, which is regrettable, for everyone realizes that had we at that time succeeded in reaching agreement on the lines suggested by us, the war danger would

now be far less. But now that rockets have become our principal means of defense, and NATO generals would readily sell their souls to the devil if only they could find out the location of those defenses, the measures can no longer be carried out in the absence of general and complete disarmament.

The Soviet Government has approached the disarmament problem from different angles. For a number of years we proposed, for example, reaching agreement on the withdrawal of foreign troops from German territory or, to begin with, on reducing those troops by one-third, our purpose being a relaxation of tension in Europe where the armed forces of the two alignments of countries are in direct contact. But this Soviet proposal too was left hanging in the air because of the Western Powers' negative attitude.

Unfortunately, the Western Powers do not want any agreement on disarmament questions. Their negative stand is particularly manifest in their refusal to come to terms on the discontinuance of all atomic and nuclear weapons tests.

It is true that nuclear tests are not the same as nuclear war. But their aftereffects are very serious for mankind even now. The new major series of nuclear tests which the U.S. Government is carrying out jointly with the British Government is a challenge to mankind. Matters have reached a point where the United States is testing nuclear weapons in space, even though the

effect of the tests on people's physical environment may prove very dangerous.

President Kennedy has stated that there is no health hazard in his country, nor will there be from U.S. tests. Mr. Kennedy did not tell the truth to the people of his country. Present-day scientific data indicate that U.S. tests are doing enormous damage to people's health. Besides the earth is inhabited not only by Americans but also by the British, Russian, Chinese, Japanese, French, Italian and other peoples. Yet those who are carrying on tests do not even see fit to think of them and the harm they are doing to the health of these peoples.

It should be clear to everyone that by carrying out this new and largest series of nuclear weapons tests, the U.S. and its allies want to secure military advantages for themselves and intensify their aggressive policies. They have been doggedly following these policies, which imperil peace, for many long years. You will recall that in 1958 the Soviet Union stopped its nuclear weapons tests by unilateral action. But what did the United States, Britain and France do? They stepped up the arms race. France began to test its atom bombs. The aggressive NATO bloc began openly to threaten us with war over a German peace treaty. In those conditions the Soviet Union was compelled to take steps to perfect its thermonuclear weapons so as to cool certain hotheads who suggested wiping out Russia "at one blow."

We would have committed a crime against our people and all mankind had we not prevented the dangerous developments of last summer. Anyone who follows world developments knows that the Soviet Union's rocket and nuclear might is the decisive factor in the maintenance of peace and has on more than one occasion saved mankind from a world war which the imperialist circles of the West had been trying to start. Today, when the militarists in Western countries are intensifying their aggressive policies, we cannot but take steps to strengthen the defenses of the Soviet Union and the socialist community at large.

By increasing its might, the Soviet Union promotes not only its own interests but also those of all mankind, and contributes to the maintenance of world peace. But we are by no means happy that we have to spend so much effort and resources on the production of modern weapons. Our scientists and technicians could find a much better use for their knowledge and experience. The improvement of weapons is an unavoidable necessity for the socialist countries. It would be much better if all weapons were dumped into the sea. We stand for general and complete disarmament. We are ready to sign an agreement with all the nuclear powers to ban all tests of these weapons. This would be a big step toward general disarmament. But nobody will live to see the socialist countries disarm unilaterally.

The "atomic genie" which has broken loose would long since have been driven back into the

vessel but for Western resistance. Control over the discontinuance of the tests is no longer a problem. The present state of science makes it possible to detect all nuclear explosions by means of national systems without any particular difficulty. An agreement banning nuclear weapon tests would have been reached long ago had the Western Powers shown, in the course of negotiations, as much as a fraction of the good will shown by the Soviet Union.

Last spring the U.S. Government sent three delegations abroad. One of them went to Geneva, another to the session of the NATO Council at Athens, and the third, the most numerous, to the area of the Christmas and Johnston Islands to supervise nuclear tests.

The activity of which of the three delegations reflects with greatest clarity the essence of U.S. policy? Everything indicates that it is the activity of the second and third. As for the Geneva delegation, it is a sort of cover. A very short time ago, on June 16 last, U.S. Secretary of Defense McNamara, said: "But we cannot hope to move toward our objective unless we move from strength."

The blasts over Christmas Island are part of that policy being put into effect.They strike at the hopes of the peoples. But they can neither weaken nor shake our will to fight for disarmament and for the discontinuance of nuclear explosions, everywhere and forever. History itself demands ever more imperatively that all weapons and means of warfare be abolished.

Dear delegates, allow me now to say a few words about the German question. This question has no direct bearing on disarmament but is closely linked with it. A peaceful settlement with Germany and normalization of the situation in West Berlin on that basis would ease international tension and also provide a sound groundwork for furthering the cause of disarmament. This is increasingly realized by many statesmen.

Indeed, those who strive for peace cannot but feel seriously alarmed, since the hotbed of war danger in the heart of Europe is becoming ever more ominous. German militarism and revanchism, which has brought incredible suffering to the peoples, has once again been nurtured in West Germany by the U.S. monopolies and is embarking more and more openly on a course of aggression and adventure. Although Chancellor Adenauer poses as an opponent of the Hitler regime, he has the backing of Hitler generals and officers and is in effect pursuing a Hitlerite policy. Here are the facts.

During his term in office Adenauer has spent more on West German armaments than Hitler spent on preparations for the Second World War. Hitler's military expenditure from 1933 to 1939 totaled 90 billion marks, while that of Chancellor Adenauer between 1950 and 1961 alone amounted to 100 billion marks. Peaceloving mankind cannot but stop to think of these figures, for they are figures of death and suffering for the people. Hitler generals have been entrusted with

the command of the NATO ground forces in Europe. Certain European countries are beginning to march to the drumbeat of the Bonn revenge-seekers, and even the Great Powers are beginning to dance in time with it.

The West German militarists fiercely resist disarmament and a relaxation of international tension. In 1874 Moltke, an ideologist of German militarism, said cynically: "Everlasting peace is a dream, and, moreover, an ugly one." Many changes have come about in the world since then. But the cannibalistic ideology of German militarism is unchanged. Defense Minister Strauss resists all disarmament plans with might and main. The Bonn militarists are reaching out for the atom bomb. And they are already close to getting it, as the Athens session of the NATO Council showed.

Bonn makes no secret of its plans for a forcible revision of the results of the last war, for a revision of the German frontiers established under the Potsdam Agreements. Minister Seebohm of Bonn says: "Czechoslovakia, Poland and the Soviet Union should not entertain the hope that we have renounced the territories beyond the Oder and the Neisse." He is seconded by Von Hassel, Minister-President of Schleswig Holstein, who says: "Our territorial claims reach far beyond the Oder-Neisse line. We want to regain the old regions of German domination."

Some revenge-seeking politicians, including Herr Brandt, even take the liberty of threatening the socialist countries.

From these threats and from what the Bonn politicians are doing, one might doubt whether they were living in 1962 or whether the hands of their watches had stopped at the time of Hitler's campaigns of conquest.

What the Soviet Union advocates is to write "finis" to the Second World War, conclude a peace treaty with the two German states, and on this basis normalize the situation in West Berlin, which is fraught with explosive potentials.

This is obviously the only possible and sensible stand to take. Yet the U.S., British and French Governments are against the conclusion of a German peace treaty. They are trying to perpetuate the occupation regime in West Berlin and keep their troops there. But how can one be reconciled to the fact that in the center of Europe there is a powder keg with a burning fuse? In what way can this fact answer the interests of the people of West Berlin or any country?

It meets only the objectives of the manufacturers of lethal weapons and the West German revenge-seekers. Strictly speaking, the Western statesmen on whom agreement on the conclusion of a peace treaty depends are aware of this, and the only reason they do not conclude a treaty is that they do not want to hurt the feelings of their ally Chancellor Adenauer. West Germany and its armed forces are already becoming the backbone of the aggressive forces of NATO and are shaping the policies of that bloc to an increasing extent. As for those who believe themselves to be the

leaders, they connive with the West German revenge-seekers on the plea that Western unity must not be impaired. Under the guise of preserving Western unity, that is, NATO unity, they take their cue from the aggressive forces in West Germany.

One must not overlook yet another circumstance. The present occupation of West Berlin has long since ceased to be the occupation that was implied at the time the Allies signed their quadrilateral agreements following the defeat of Hitler Germany. Those agreements were aimed at abolishing German militarism and nazism and preventing the threat of a new war on the part of Germany. But occupied West Berlin today is a special kind of NATO military base, where the troops of the powers in that aggressive bloc are stationed, a base directed against former allies—the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia and a number of other countries which fought against Hitler Germany.

We want West Berlin, an independent political unit, to be given the most reliable international guarantees, want its people to be granted the right freely to shape their own way of life. But the Western Powers are concerned with the maintenance of their military base in West Berlin and not with the destiny of the population of that city.

The Soviet Government has taken a number of steps to bring about mutually acceptable decisions and has agreed to the occupation forces in West Berlin being replaced on certain conditions by UN or neutral troops. As no agreement has been

reached on this matter, we suggest that the troops to be stationed in West Berlin should be those of Norway and Denmark or of Belgium and the Netherlands as well as those of Poland and Czechoslovakia. Needless to say, those troops should be under the United Nations flag and should not represent either of the existing military alignments.

Time is pressing! If the Western Powers persist in their refusal to contribute to the elimination of the vestiges of the Second World War, the socialist countries, as well as other peaceloving countries, will have no choice but to conclude a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, with all the consequences that may entail.

The example of Laos shows that, given a desire for agreement, ways can be found of settling the most challenging and complicated international problems. Removal of the vestiges of the Second World War is vital to peace, and the solution of this problem brooks no further delay. Disarmament, the exclusion of war from the life of society, and the establishment of a lasting peace on earth constitute one of the cherished goals of the Soviet people and their government.

As far back as the last century Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, the eminent author of *The Song of Hiawatha,* said:

"Bury your war clubs and your weapons . . .
Smoke the calumet together."

I do not smoke, but, really, I would be happy to smoke the pipe of peace together with the leaders of all powers!

3. A WORLD WITHOUT ARMS WOULD BE A GREAT BLESSING FOR ALL MANKIND

Martin Andersen Nexö, an outstanding representative of world culture, said that people needed peace "to work, to rejoice and to make life beautiful." Disarmament and peace could open up truly inexhaustible wellsprings of creative endeavor, which today are being blocked by the militarists. The huge resources thrown into the maw of war preparations could be switched to meeting the pressing needs of mankind, which are so numerous.

The disarmament problem has lately drawn the attention of increasingly wide sections of the population in the West, including the United States. In a number of cases scientists give a sober analysis of the eventual social and economic effects of general disarmament.

The conclusions arrived at by a team of experts who recently prepared, on instructions from the United Nations, a report on the economic and social consequences of disarmament are worthy of note. The report stresses that disarmament would produce beneficial results and lead to an improvement in the condition of the peoples of all countries. If the governments proceed with determination to switch funds from military to peaceful uses, the report points out "no country need fear a lack of useful employment opportunities for the resources that would become available to it through disarmament."

Yet the ideologists of military business, particu-

larly in the United States, are fairly hammering it into the minds of people that the enormous national expenditure on armaments is a means of achieving "economic prosperity" while disarmament would bring nothing but economic dislocation and increased unemployment. Is this not a disgusting and monstrous idea which makes the possibility of economic progress, of employment and a guaranteed livelihood conditional on the quantity production of the means of destruction?

Experience gives the lie to the economic arguments of the opponents of disarmament. Increasing military spending can only produce a short-lived, unhealthy expansion of industrial production, and in the final analysis leads to economic stagnation and mass unemployment. In fact, which are the capitalist countries where armaments expenditure has assumed the greatest scale in recent years? They are first of all the United States and Britain. And which are the capitalist countries where the rate of industrial growth has been the lowest during the same period? The United States and Britain.

The militarists and monopolists, who make unprecedented profits from arms production, intimidate the masses, saying that in the event of disarmament millions of people would find themselves out of jobs and an "economic disaster" would set in. This point of view is groundless. On the contrary, disarmament would bring real economic benefits to all sections of the population in the capitalist countries, above all to the working class, the farmers and the middle sections of the

urban population, whom it would relieve of the backbreaking tax burden.

Manufacturers, scientists, workers and engineers, whose well-being today depends on the arms race, on the sinister "death business," would do well to recall *Mother Courage and Her Children,* that excellent play by Bertolt Brecht, the German anti-fascist writer. The play presents the tragic portrait of a sutler who lives on war but whom war robs of her children, one after another, and thus drains her life of meaning and purpose!

In this same way, war preparations, which today are rewarded with seeming and fleeting benefits, will tomorrow exact a heavy tribute in the lives, health and future of our children and grandchildren.

It is true that disarmament alone will not solve all social problems. But stopping the insane waste of forces and funds on the means of destruction and switching these funds to peaceful purposes will undoubtedly benefit the economies of all countries. Even in so rich a capitalist country as the United States, millions of people are badly in need of housing, hospitals and schools. Even the U.S. President says that there are too many illiterate and uneducated people in the United States and that, on the other hand, the country is short of more than 127,000 classrooms.

There are no funds to build schools and hospitals and improve the living standards of the people. Yet billions of dollars are spent on the means of destruction. Disarmament would make

it possible to allocate funds for meeting the urgent needs of the American people. American economists estimate that the U.S. Government could, within the first five years following disarmament, spend 330 billion. Some 160 billion would have to be spent on clearing the slums, on housing and water supply, 30 billion on school construction and education, 35 billion on health and hospitals, and 105 billion on road-building and for other purposes. These figures smash the myth which says that in the event of disarmament there would be nothing to make up for the so-called national war market.

Disarmament would benefit the whole Western economy. The only losers would be a small handful of arms manufacturers, who would be deprived of the possibility of plundering the peoples through arms supplies. The sooner they are deprived of this possibility, the more the people will gain. But even the arms manufacturers could, if they are still human at all, reconvert their plants to the production of means for satisfying the requirements of people instead of means for exterminating people.

Disarmament would also bring tremendous advantages to the underdeveloped countries which are beginning to fulfill vast projects of national revival and to the peoples fighting for their liberation from colonial tyranny.

The liberation of peoples from the chains of colonial slavery is a great progressive development. The Soviet Union wholeheartedly supports the sacred, just struggle of the peoples against colonial-

ism. The Soviet attitude is clear and precise. There must be no people shackled by the chains of colonialism in Asia, Africa, Latin America or any other area of the globe. All peoples must be free! There is a close interconnection between the struggle for national liberation and the struggle for disarmament and peace. The struggle for general disarmament facilitates the struggle for national independence. The achievements of the national liberation movement, in their turn, promote peace and contribute to the struggle for disarmament.

The colonialists have always established and maintained their rule by force of arms. Naturally, to deprive them of arms would mean pulling out the teeth of the colonialist sharks. It would forever eliminate the possibility of any colonialist revenge and finally and irrevocably undermine the foundations of their rule in the colonies still existing. I would like to stress once again that the Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament speak, above all else, of the need of destroying modern lethal weapons. As it happens, these weapons are not in the hands of those fighting against colonialism. Disarmament means disarming the war forces, abolishing militarism, ruling out armed interference in the internal affairs of any country, and doing away completely and finally with all forms of colonialism.

That is why disarmament would make for a further development of the national liberation movement. Given a durable peace, nothing could hamper the progress of the national liberation

struggle of the peoples or prevent them from winning complete political and economic independence.

Today the underdeveloped countries are spending roughly five to six billion dollars a year for military purposes. This is a colossal amount for countries which need every single cent to break free from poverty and backwardness. There can be no doubt that, given peace and deliverance from the burden of military spending, the underdeveloped countries could develop their economies and gain economic independence sooner.

Disarmament would create proper conditions for a tremendous increase in the scale of assistance to the newly established national states. If a mere 8 to 10 per cent of the 120 billion dollars spent for military purposes throughout the world were turned to that purpose, it would be possible to end hunger, disease and illiteracy in the distressed areas of the globe within twenty years. A mere fifth of the amount spent for military purposes would be sufficient to build 96 steel plants the size of the Bhilai works in India, which is to turn out 2,500,000 tons of steel a year, or 17 giants like the Aswan Dam in the UAR.

This amount would be enough to set up from 30 to 40 power-industry centers of world significance, such as powerful industrial combines in the valleys of the Nile, Niger, the Congo and Zambezi in Africa, in the Sahara, in the valleys of the great Indus, Ganges and Mekong in Asia, in the foothills of the Andes and on the banks of South American rivers.

It is needless to speak of the beneficial effects these measures would have on the development of the young national states, of the powerful spur they would be to their industrialization and progress. Those countries could within the next 20 to 25 years overcome their economic backwardness to a considerable degree and approach the industrial standards of countries like Britain and France.

Such an advance of the newly established national states would undoubtedly require their close cooperation with the industrially developed countries. The main condition for this cooperation is genuine equality and mutual advantage. This cooperation would result in expanded production and would provide many further millions of people in all countries with jobs.

It has been calculated that with the funds spent for military purposes all over the world during the past decade an end could have been put to the housing shortage in all countries. Given general and complete disarmament, the wealth of the world could be more than doubled within 20 to 25 years.

Needless to say, the peoples of the Soviet Union and all the socialist countries have a vital concern in disarmament. As has been said, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries were compelled by the arms race to spend large sums on strengthening their defenses. We could make proper use of the funds that would be released through disarmament to carry out peacetime projects for the people's happiness.

Last autumn the Twenty-second Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) adopted its new Program in this hall. The Program envisages a titanic amount of work in creating material and spiritual values such as the age-long history of mankind has never known. Allow me to cite a few facts and figures to enable you to assess the magnitude of the tasks which the Soviet people have set themselves.

It is our intention that in 20 years the Soviet Union will produce almost double the industrial output now produced by all of the nonsocialist world. In 1980, for example, we will produce up to three trillion kilowatt-hours of electric power, or 50 percent more than the power produced by the capitalist world in 1961. We have set ourselves the imposing task of building up an abundance of all blessings and of going over to the principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

The unprecedented sweep of our building programs speaks for itself. Even many of our ill-wishers now admit that people who draw up and execute plans of that sort must be vitally interested in an enduring peace. We set our sights far ahead, we plan years and decades in advance. Our plans and targets, this accelerating rhythm of our development that justifies our likening the immense body of socialist countries from the Elbe to the Pacific Ocean to a giant building site, leaves no room for war.

The peace policy of the Soviet Union and the other countries springs directly from the nature of our society. It is part and parcel of our society. Our economic and social system has no "nutritive medium" for militarism, for a policy of conquest and for war business. We have no classes, groups or individuals yearning to seize foreign lands, external markets or spheres of investment. We have no people who profit by government war orders. In our country no group will ever fan a militarist psychosis, scaring the parliament into increasing military appropriations and taxes on the population. We have all the resources we need. All thoughts of revising borders, acquiring new territories or subjecting other countries economically are quite alien to the Soviet Union.

The desire for peace is inherent in the very nature of the socialist countries, while aggressive designs against other peoples are alien to them. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and all the other Communist Parties always appeal for friendship among the peoples, and not for attacks by one nation upon another.

The class struggle in the capitalist countries, it is true, prevails, and it is inevitable because it springs from the division of society into classes. The outcome of the class struggle, the choice of the way of life and of the system is a domestic affair of the population of each country.

The Communists of all countries, assembled at their meeting in 1960, adopted a Peace Manifesto, in which they solemnly proclaimed that they con-

sider struggle for the preservation and promotion of peace a sacred duty.

Our constructive twenty-year program also defines the chief purpose of Soviet foreign policy. This purpose is to ensure a peaceful environment for the building of a communist society in the Soviet Union and the development of the world socialist system, and to deliver mankind, in concert with all the peace-loving peoples, from a worldwide destructive war.

The great ideals of peace, labor, freedom, equality, fraternity and happiness for all nations are inscribed on our banner.

V. I. Lenin proclaimed disarmament as the socialist ideal. As far back as 1922, in Genoa, at the first international conference attended by the Soviet state, our country's spokesmen, on Lenin's instructions, proposed universal disarmament and the disbandment of standing armies.

This was the first proposal for general disarmament to come formally from a state in the history of mankind. And we are proud that it came from our socialist state, from its head of government, V. I. Lenin.

A big period of history lies between Genoa 1922 and Geneva 1962. Deep-seated changes have occurred on our planet. But today, just as forty years ago, the Soviet standpoint in matters of disarmament is essentially the same.

We have always advocated disarmament and apply all our efforts to reinforcing world peace. The most radical proposals in behalf of peace—the pro-

posal to conclude a German peace treaty, to ban nuclear tests and totally eliminate nuclear weapons, to establish atom-free zones, to reduce the armed forces, to conclude a peace pact, to settle all controversial matters by negotiation, and, last but not least, crowning them all, the Draft Treaty for General and Complete Disarmament—have all come from the Soviet Union. We worked for peace and disarmament when we were still weak in a military way. We work for peace and disarmament now when—let's be frank about it—we have the most perfect of weapons that no other power possesses. Is this not the best possible proof that the Soviet Union does not want war?

Between 1955 and 1958 we have, on our own, unilaterally reduced our armed forces by 2,140,000 men. We gave up war bases in Port Arthur and Finland. Could any country afford to reduce its armed forces to that extent if it were preparing for attack? Only a country that seeks peace can afford to do so. And we regret that the other countries negotiating disarmament with us have not followed suit. In 1960 the session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR adopted a decision to reduce the strength of the Soviet Armed Forces by another third, or 1,200,000 men. The Soviet Union had begun to effect this decision, but the unveiled Western threat to go to war against the Soviet Union compelled us to suspend the discharge of soldiers and officers.

If the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries had not been threatened by the Western ag-

gressive forces, which are armed to the teeth, we would long since have disbanded our armies and converted our war industries to civilian production. In the past four years we have been spending an annual average of about 10 billion new rubles on defense. It is easily seen how much faster our gigantic construction program would proceed if these vast resources were put into peaceful development.

But so long as the aggressive imperialist forces exist, we are compelled to produce powerful modern weapons, keep the necessary armed forces, and maintain the defenses of the Soviet state at a level that ensures the decisive and complete defeat of the aggressor. But we are ready to disarm at any moment, even tomorrow, if the capitalist countries do likewise.

General and complete disarmament would ring in a truly historic change in men's lives—from the epoch of wars to the epoch of lasting peace on earth. This historic change can come true. It must come true! Everything depends on the masses, on their perseverance and determination.

4. THE PEOPLES CAN AND MUST ACHIEVE DISARMAMENT AND PRESERVE THE PEACE

Mankind can and must live without war. War in the contemporary epoch is not fatally inevitable. But neither is peace fatally inevitable.

The question is whether the people today have the resources to stop the race toward death, toward a new war. We say unequivocally: yes, they have. Today there are real and powerful forces capable of protecting the peace. They are the Soviet Union and the world socialist system, which present a powerful barrier to a new world war; the many young sovereign states favoring general disarmament and lasting peace, which include such great powers as India and Indonesia; and the peace-loving forces in all countries, fighting for the elimination of the very possibility of armed conflicts.

The world peace movement, headed by the World Council of Peace, and the various other organizations of peace fighters are making a big contribution to the lofty cause of peace. Present at the congress are spokesmen for many new organizations that have joined the battle for peace. This shows that the peace movement is expanding and gaining strength. The fight for peace, waged by the finest sons of the people in the capitalist countries, is hampered by great difficulties. A hail of reprisals is showered upon the courageous men and women who truly represent the conscience of mankind. But in spite of hardships, they carry on their noble work perseveringly. And grateful mankind will never forget their efforts.

It is not to be expected, of course, that the militarists will want to disarm of their own volition. The warlike groups are resisting disarmament desperately and will continue to do so. We must never forget that so long as the militarists, those makers

of military thunderclaps, exist in Europe and America, the danger of war will persist. But there are forces in the world today capable of compelling them to disarm.

Great trials have fallen to the lot of our generation. Grave responsibilities rest upon its shoulders. If we live up to them and check the aggressive forces, it will mean that we will have wrought a safe future for mankind.

People conscious of the future and the happiness of their children will realize that though much has been done in the past years to preserve and fortify peace, much more remains to be done, a hundred and a thousand times more.

There are strong forces waging an effective struggle for an enduring peace, for a greater understanding among countries and nations, and for the great idea of general and complete disarmament in the United States, Britain, West Germany, France and other member-countries of the various aggressive blocs. That is quite true. Many individuals belonging to the ruling classes take part in this struggle as well, because they see the present world situation in a sober and realistic light.

But to speak frankly, many people in the Western countries do not appreciate all the dangers of a nuclear war and stay out of the active struggle for disarmament and peace. Many trade unions, large sections of the working class, the agricultural workers and the intelligentsia have not yet joined in the battle. Yet, hand in hand with the present peace fighters, they are capable of making the

Western ruling quarters heed the will of the peoples. Quite a number of people are led astray by the slogans of parties that speak sweet words of peace, especially at election time, while in effect the governments composed of their members are carrying on the arms race. Yet these parties, which have had a hand in founding the aggressive NATO, SEATO and CENTO blocs, get the electorate's approval over and over again for forming governments.

The indisputable fact and the complexity of the present international situation lie in that the top leadership of the principal Western bourgeois parties and many of the right-wing leaders of Social Democratic parties favor the arms race.

Take the United States. It has a Democratic and a Republican Party. There are disputes between them, though it is impossible for a man unversed in politics to appreciate their purport, but in matters concerning war preparations the Republican elephant and the Democratic donkey are in one harness. It is the same in West Germany. The party of war and revenge, headed by Adenauer, sets the tune, and the leadership of the Social Democratic Party chimes in. In Britain the right-wing Labor Party leadership falls in with the conservatives and gives active support to their war measures in defiance of the will of the rank-and-file membership and the trade unions on the cardinal issue of war and peace.

The picture is essentially the same so far as the French rulers are concerned. As for the other

NATO, SEATO and CENTO member-countries, they play what is in effect a secondary role and have no say to speak of in matters of war and peace. In Norway and Denmark the governments are headed by Social Democrats. But instead of acting upon the will of the working class and the rest of the working people, who do not want war, they fall in with the militarist forces and help work out arms race decisions in the aggressive NATO bloc.

In all frankness, there is a tremendous discrepancy between the will of the peoples, who appreciate the dangers of a new world war, and the fact that nuclear war preparations are being stepped up in the Western countries. The somewhat passive attitude to the peace struggle of many sections of the population there, and the fact that they underrate their own possibilities, play into the hands of the war-makers.

General and complete disarmament is truly a great goal and calls for great actions and great efforts by all the peoples. With a live sense of the decisiveness and gravity of the hour, we should like to declare from this rostrum to all men and women, regardless of their social background and convictions, to the generation that has lived through the terrors of war, and to the young people who know about war only from what their elders tell them: *This is the time to act! In the name of life on earth and the happiness of all men, in the name of the future of mankind, show firmness and determination in demanding the banning of atomic weapons and general disarmament!*

If the people act, they can compel the high priests of war to retreat from the political arena, make governments alter their policy and the climate of international relations as a whole. But for this they must act, act, and act again. That is the main thing.

It is especially the *workers,* who with their families comprise more than half of the population in the developed capitalist countries, who can do a lot in behalf of peace. The many millions of the working class, the class of creators to whom destruction is alien, are destined by history to thwart the atomic maniacs and to deliver mankind from the deadly peril that hangs over it.

The *agricultural workers,* the second largest section of the popular force, are also vitally interested in preventing a nuclear war. The time has come for the voice of the peasant masses to resound against war throughout the world.

Can the women, who give life to new generations, fail to show a special, I dare say, unparalleled, activity in the struggle against the forces threatening to start a nuclear war? A war of that sort would turn the bright world of children into a world of orphans and cripples.

And the young people—does not the solution of the cardinal question of our time depend on them to a large extent? To the young, war is frustration of all their hopes, it is ravished youth. Peace is breath-taking prospects of creation, realization of dreams, enhancement of mankind's wealth and exploration of the universe.

I should like to say that the role of the intellectuals, the scientists, those magicians of spiritual culture and discoverers of more and more secrets of nature, has never been so important. It is good to see that many scientists and men of culture, aware of what modern lethal weapons spell for mankind, are sounding the alarm, calling on the peoples to bridle the forces of war before it is too late. The great French scientist Joliot-Curie, who served to his dying breath as an inspiring example of dedication to peace, will live in the memory of men forever.

Can the scientists and technicians developing atomic and hydrogen bombs, rockets, war planes, submarines and ships wash their hands of all responsibility if these tools of death are used to attack peaceloving countries? In the Western countries scientists, technicians and workingmen develop unprecedentedly lethal weapons, while a handful of capitalist monopoly bosses control them.

It should go against the conscience and intelligence of scientists and technicians that the powerful weapons they have developed should be turned against civilization, against the peoples, against themselves, against life on earth. The fundamental difference between the situation of scientists doing military work in the socialist and the imperialist countries is quite obvious. The Soviet scientists work in a country that is fighting to banish war from the life of society. They work for the sake of fortifying peace. But like the rest of the Soviet

people, they would prefer to give their strength and skill to building and building only in a world disarmed.

History also brings businessmen in the capitalist countries face to face with the sharpest of questions. In past wars the death of millions of people yielded fabulous profits to members of the business world, but modern war will yield them death instead of profits. Nuclear weapons draw no line between the rich and the poor. Only ultra-militarists on the brink of insanity, who disdain the destiny of nations, hope to sit it out in bomb shelters. There is no shelter from nuclear bombs. He who wants to live must fight for disarmament.

The independent Asian, African and Latin American countries, usually called nonaligned or neutralist, are beginning to play an increasingly important part in the grand battle for peace. India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, Brazil, Ghana, Guinea, Ceylon, Burma, Afghanistan, Mali and many other countries are in favor of signing a treaty on general and complete disarmament.

There can be no neutrality on the question of general and complete disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war. If war breaks out, it will involve not only the belligerents, it will bring grave calamities to the populations of the neutralist countries. The neutralist countries should make their contribution to the solution of the all-important question of our day. They will make that contribution if their policy in matters of disarmament does not succumb to external political and eco-

nomic pressures and is not influenced by mercantile and transient interests.

Dear delegates, the struggle for peace has brought together people of different classes and political convictions. The situation of an impending storm calls for a truly worldwide antiwar alliance of the peoples, expressing the will of all social groups, all the nations of Europe, Asia, Africa, America and Oceania. There can be only one goal for the program and the activities of this truly worldwide association of diverse peaceloving forces —to prevent a thermonuclear war and to isolate the warlike maniacs.

Let me reassure the congress that the Soviet Union will continue to apply all its efforts in behalf of the great and lofty cause of peace.

The Soviet Union is for peace and friendship among all nations. Our government has instructed me to declare from this rostrum that the Soviet people want to live in peace and friendship with the industrious and gifted people of America. The Soviet and American peoples have no grounds to be hostile toward each other. Peace and friendship are in their common interest. The Soviet people call on the American people, just as on all other peoples, to work together for these lofty aims.

I should like to stress once more that the masses and their action are the decisive force in the battle for disarmament. May the worldwide movement for universal disarmament and peace expand each day and each week. May all the people rise and

by their actions achieve disarmament and block the road to world war.

The greater the army of peace fighters, the more active it is, the sooner will general and complete disarmament be accomplished. The people of every country will no doubt find effective forms and methods of struggle for universal disarmament and enduring peace consistent with the specific local conditions, and thereby do their bit for the solution of this problem.

Over a hundred years ago Victor Hugo spoke at the Paris Congress of Friends of Peace of a future day when guns would be exhibited at museums and people would wonder how such barbarism was possible in the past. "The day will come," Victor Hugo exclaimed, "when markets open to trade and minds open to ideas will be the only battlefields."

"Peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none," was what that great American, Thomas Jefferson, wanted to see in the field of international relations of the future.

In the days of Hugo and Jefferson these appeals were a magnificent but impractical dream. Today, when there is a powerful world socialist system throwing its weight on the scales of the peace struggle, when a large group of peaceful Asian, African and Latin American countries has emerged in the international arena, and when the general democratic working class and national liberation movements have become decisive factors of our

NOV 29 '66

time, real conditions are arising in which the dreams of generations for peace can be realized at last.

Friends, the peoples are pinning far-reaching hopes on the work of this congress. *So may its summons be heard throughout the universe, inspiring new tens of millions of people to fight for enduring peace on earth with determination and dedication!*

Once the various streams of which the movement against the threat of nuclear war is composed merge into one common torrent, its force will be irresistible. It will surge over all the continents like the spring floods and sweep the obstacles to general and complete disarmament out of the way.

Hail to the fighters for peace, for the prevention of a nuclear world war!

Long live enduring peace and friendship among all nations!

Thank you for your attention.

909.82
D637
no. 20
c. 2

University of Florida ALF

31262033044875

50 cents

THE WORLD CONGRESS for GENERAL DISARMAMENT and PEACE

Address by N.S. Khrushchev

Among the topics discussed in this important speech are the following:

The need for general and complete disarmament . . . U.S. Defense Secretary McNamara's proposal that "rules" be adopted to guide the conduct of nuclear war . . . The preventive war doctrine . . . Mistakes and accidents . . . Is atomic war just a bigger conventional war? . . . The Soviet disarmament program and criticism of Western proposals . . . A world without arms — the benefits to both sides . . . Contribution of the world peace movement.

CROSSCURRENTS PRESS

156 Fifth Avenue • New York 10, New York